

UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY REGION VIII, MONTANA OFFICE FEDERAL BUILDING, 301 S. PARK, DRAWER 10096 HELENA, MONTANA 59626-0096

Ref: 8MO

October 17,1989

Site Fast Helena
File # 1.10 and 2.00
Confidential: Yes _____ No ____
Admin. Record: Yes _____ No ____
Key Words/Comments: EPA's response
to ARCO's comments on
Process Ponds Proposed
Plan

Mr. Robert W. Lawrence, Esq. Parcel, Mauro, Hultin and Spaanstra, P.C. Attorneys at Law 1801 California Street, Suite 3600 Denver, CO 80202

Re: The EPA's response to comments submitted by the Atlantic Richfield Company (ARCO) concerning the Proposed Plan for cleanup of the process ponds at the East Helena smelter site (CERCLA)

Dear Mr. Lawrence:

Your letter of September 20 requested additional time for ARCO to conduct a review of the Process Ponds Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study and it offered comments concerning the EPA's selected remedy as presented in the Proposed Plan.

With respect to your comments on behalf of ARCO, because they raise essentially the same issues raised by Jon Nickel (on behalf of ASARCO), I enclose a copy of the EPA's response to Mr. Nickel. It explains that the EPA has received the information needed to reevaluate the in situ treatment method for Lower Lake water and has selected this method as part of the preferred remedy. It also explains the EPA's rationale for requiring two feet of excavation below the artificially deposited layers at Lower Lake and Thornock Lake, and deep excavation at the remaining areas. Briefly, deep excavation is necessary at the acid plant because soils there exhibit characteristics of EP toxicity throughout the soil profile tested (from the surface down to the coarse gravels).

These issues were raised consistently by those who provided comments, both written and spoken. In light of the uniformity among comments, in light of the EPA's willingness to make important adjustments in response to comments, and in light of the fact that the EPA, state, community and ASARCO already agreed in principle on the major components of the remedy, we felt that 21 days were adequate for public review. Therefore, we see no need to extend the comment period.

If you have any question or concern that has not been addressed, please do not hesitate to contact Sandra Moreno or me. We appreciate your input and we take this opportunity to remind you that a more comprehensive site-wide feasibility study will be released for public review approximately 6-8 months from now. As was done in the case of the Process Ponds Proposed Plan, I will send a copy of the plan and an announcement concerning the availability of the RI/FS report to Robert Dent at the beginning of the public review period for that report.

Sincerely,

D. Scott Brown

Remedial Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: Sandra Moreno, 8RC

Patty Lee, ICF

Dave Bunte, CH2M Hill Jon Nickel, ASARCO